School Vandalism in Alberta an Up-Dated Status Study 1974-1977

Prepared by
Dr. C. J. Schott
The University of Lethbridge
Faculty of Education
Lethbridge, Alberta

planning & research

Alberta
EDUCATION

101-06578/

SCHOOL VANDALISM IN ALBERTA

AN UP-DATED STATUS STUDY

1974 - 1977

By

Dr. C. J. Schott

The University of Lethbridge

Faculty of Education

Lethbridge, Alberta.

LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY OF ONTARIO
TORONTO
SEP 20 19[illegible]
RECEIVED

Under contract to:

Alberta Education
Edmonton, Alberta
Canada.

June 1978

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iii-iv
ABSTRACT	v-vi
SCHOOL VANDALISM IN ALBERTA: AN UP-DATED STUDY 1974-1977..	1
CONCLUSIONS	21
SUMMARY	23
APPENDIX 1 ALBERTA SCHOOLS VANDALISM SURVEY	25
APPENDIX 2 TABLES 22-48	28

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1	Vandalism Costs by Category and Year	3
Table 2	.....	4
Tables 3, 4 and 5	.....	5
Tables 6 and 7	.....	6
Table 8	.....	7
Table 9	Total Vandalism Costs for 1974-1977 by Month and Category	8
Table 10	Vandalism Costs by Category of Damage and Type of School 1974	9
Table 11	Vandalism Costs by Category of Damage and Type of School 1975	10
Table 12	Vandalism Costs by Category of Damage and Type of School 1976	11
Table 13	Vandalism Costs by Category of Damage and Type of School 1977	12
Table 14	Comparison of Total $ Costs per Pupil for all Categories of Damage	13
Table 15	Glass Damage (Dollar Costs Per Pupil)	14
Table 16	Building and Contents Damage (Dollar Costs Per Pupil)	15
Table 17	Theft (Dollar Costs Per Pupil)	16
Table 18	Arson (Dollar Costs Per Pupil)	17
Tables 19 and 20	.....	18
Table 21	Ratio of Number of Incidents of Vandalism to Enrollment (Per Thousand Students)	19
Table 22	Total Cost of Vandalism by Category, Year, Dollar Cost per Incident and Costs per Incident per Student	28
Table 23	Amounts Reimbursed by Insurance and Individual.....	28

		Page
Table 24	Comparative Annual Vandalism Costs (Including Cost of Security Measures)	29
Table 25	Cost of Vandalism by Category, Month and Year 1974.....	29
Table 26	Cost of Vandalism by Category, Month and Year 1975.....	30
Table 27	Cost of Vandalism by Category, Month and Year 1976.....	30
Table 28	Cost of Vandalism by Category, Month and Year 1977.....	31
Table 29	Total $ Costs Public/Urban by Category and Year.....	31
Table 30	Monthly Cost Public/Urban by Category 1974.....	32
Table 31	Monthly Cost Public/Urban by Category 1975.....	32
Table 32	Monthly Cost Public/Urban by Category 1976.....	32
Table 33	Monthly Cost Public/Urban by Category 1977.....	33
Table 34	Total $ Costs Separate/Urban by Category and Year.....	33
Table 35	Monthly Cost Separate/Urban by Category 1974.....	34
Table 36	Monthly Cost Separate/Urban by Category 1975.....	34
Table 37	Monthly Cost Separate/Urban by Category 1976.....	34
Table 38	Monthly Cost Separate/Urban by Category 1977.....	35
Table 39	Total Public/Rural by Category and Year.....	35
Table 40	Monthly Cost Public/Rural by Category 1974.....	36
Table 41	Monthly Cost Public/Rural by Category 1975.....	36
Table 42	Monthly Cost Public/Rural by Category 1976.....	36
Table 43	Monthly Cost Public/Rural by Category 1977.....	37
Table 44	Total Cost Separate/Rural by Category and Year.....	37
Table 45	Monthly Cost Separate/Rural by Category 1974.....	38
Table 45	Monthly Cost Separate/Rural by Category 1975.....	38
Table 46	Monthly Cost Separate/Rural by Category 1976.....	38
Table 48	Monthly Cost Separate/Rural by Category 1977.....	39

ABSTRACT

In 1975 a proposal for ascertaining the precise costs of vandalism in the schools throughout the province of Alberta was approved by the Planning and Research Division of the Department of Education.

Accordingly, a survey was made of all the school divisions and districts in Alberta utilizing a prepared form which required the Secretary-Treasurer to indicate the dollar costs for the calendar year 1974 of school vandalism in each of four categories:

1. Glass damage
2. Building and interior content damage
3. Theft associated with break-ins
4. Arson

Further, these costs were separated by the month in which they were incurred, together with a monthly tabulation of incidents of vandalism. Enrollment figures were obtained so that per pupils cost could be established as well as such other pertinent data as the size of administrative, teaching, and custodial staff.

In addition to determining the costs of school vandalism in the year 1974 in the categories aforementioned, an attempt was made to answer some supplementary, but important questions about vandalism, namely:

a. Why was it being done and by whom?
b. How could these delinquent acts against the school be stopped or substantially reduced?
c. What are the immediate steps that can be taken to reduce vandalism?
d. What are the long-range solutions?

The result was the publication of a report in 1976: School Vandalism in Alberta: An Investigation Into the Nature, Costs and Contributing Factors.

This study is in the nature of a follow-up for the years 1975-1976-1977 to determine any significant trends that might be evident from the data obtained in much the same manner as for 1974, the year of the initial survey.

Analysis of the data supplied for the years 1974-1977, while indicating higher overall totals when comparing the beginning year (1974) with the last year of the study (1977), nevertheless reveals a relatively stable condition. What substantial categorical increases there are can be explained in terms of the inflationary costs of replacement and repair which calculates at about 10% per year. As far as judgements about the heavy investments in security measures, it is still too soon to make any

statements about their effectiveness except to point out that school jurisdictions seem to be holding their own with respect to vandalism losses.

Arson continues to form the major bulk of these losses despite the fact, on an annual basis, it is not a constant factor. Restitution from insurance, however, reimburses school jurisdictions so victimized for the major, if not entire, portion. This study did not include insurance premiums as a vandalism cost factor when, in fact, it would have been quite correct to do so. Despite full restitution in the event of arson, if the net result is a substantial rise in insurance premiums, then the increase should be considered a legitimate cost of vandalism.

SCHOOL VANDALISM IN ALBERTA
AN UP-DATED STATUS STUDY
1974 - 1977

In 1975 a proposal for ascertaining the costs of vandalism in the schools throughout the province of Alberta was approved by the Planning and Research Branch of the Department of Education.

Accordingly, a survey was made of all the school divisions and districts in Alberta utilizing a prepared form (Appendix 1) which required the Secretary-Treasurer to indicate the dollar costs for the calendar year 1974 of school vandalism in each of four categories:

(1) Glass damage

(2) Building and interior content damage

(3) Theft associated with break-ins

(4) Arson

Further, these costs were separated by the month in which they were incurred, together with a monthly tabulation of incidents of vandalism. Enrollment figures were obtained so that per pupils costs could be established as well as such other pertinent data as the size of administrative, teaching, and custodial staff.

In addition to determining the costs of school vandalism in the year 1974 in the categories aforementioned, an attempt was made to answer some supplementary, but important questions about vandalism, namely:

(a) Why was it being done and by whom?

(b) How could these delinquent acts against the school be stopped or substantially reduced?

(c) What are the immediate steps that can be taken to reduce vandalism?

(d) What are the long-range solutions?

The result was the publication of a report in 1976: School Vandalism in Alberta: An Investigation Into the Nature, Costs and Contributing Factors.

What follows is in the nature of a follow-up study for the years 1975-1976-1977 to determine any significant trends that might be evident from data obtained in much the same manner as for 1974, the year of the initial survey.

Several general comments must be made in order to avoid any misconceptions or misunderstandings. First, and perhaps foremost, the caveat must be delivered that the "precise" costs of acts of vandalism in our provincial schools cannot be readily or accurately measured under the conditions which obtain at the present. The statistics derived in these studies are at best only estimates of the actual number of incidents and costs. As was pointed out in the previous study, there is no uniform, provincial-wide reporting system for school vandalism; there is a lack of a standard, operational definition of just what constitutes "vandalism." Nor, for many reporting school jurisdictions, are the records, whatever form they might take, accurately and conscientiously kept, if at all. Indeed, school systems that do devise reporting systems that accurately reflect the realities of their situation run the risk of invidious comparison with other school systems as a result of the higher levels reported.

Other factors affecting the interpretation of the survey data is the problem of inflation. Dollar costs in themselves are misleading and any increases indicated for a particular year must be taken in the context of corresponding increases in the number of incidents as well as the added costs of replacement and repair. Occasionally, a single act of vandalism, particularly an incident of arson, will have a shattering impact on the total costs to a school jurisdiction which, while showing a significant increase in dollar costs, might have at the same time reflected a decrease in the total number of incidents.

Furthermore, vandalism costs must take into account the rather substantial amounts that are now being spent on sophisticated security systems designed to prevent or discourage vandalism. While this survey has taken this particular factor into account in terms of total costs, it has not considered the insurance premium costs which each year has increased substantially enough, particularly in the glass damage category, so as to discourage any kind of protection at all. Certainly this aspect of the problem deserves additional and careful study.

School vandalism costs broken down into categories of damage reveals the following:

TABLE 1
VANDALISM COSTS BY CATEGORY AND YEAR

	1974	1975	1976	1977
Glass Damage	363	347	366	458
Bldg Damage and Contents	374	339	415	519
Theft	43	93	98	48
Arson	1,201	530	44	1,090
Totals	1,981	1,310	923	2,114

NOTES: In all tables differences in row and/or column totals are due to round-off error. Total costs, incidents and enrollment are expressed in thousands.

There would appear to be a significant, if undramatic and uneven, increase in the dollar losses in the categories of glass, building damage and theft. If one were to ignore the arson figures which do tend to fluctuate dramatically from year to year, the result in total costs

(Glass, Building damage and Theft) for each year is:

TABLE 2

1974	$ 780,000
1975	780,000
1976	879,000
1977	1,025.000

The costs figure for 1977 shown above would then represent an approximate 31% increase over the years since 1974. Thus, application of an estimated inflationary factor of 45% for all categories of damage reveals that school jurisdictions are more than holding their own in the battle against vandalism costs.

This interpretation receives additional support when one examines the costs for glass damage between that shown for 1974 as compared with 1977: $363,000 and $458,000 respectively (Table 1 on previous page). This represents an increase of approximately 26% which, when taking into account an inflationary factor of 10% per year for replacement costs, inclusive of materials and labor, would substantiate a "holding" pattern within this particular category.

The number of incidents of vandalism is an important figure when attempting an interpretation of annual trend. The data below would seem to support the notion that the schools are managing to contain the problem and perhaps even effect reductions.

TABLE 3

	1974	1975	1976	1977
Total # of Incidents	12	10	7	9

When the number of incidents are divided into the total dollar costs, the result is:

TABLE 4

	1974	1975	1976	1977
$ Costs per Incident	165	131	132	235

If we were to divide the total dollar costs by the number of students enrolled in the school jurisdictions reporting, we obtain the dollar costs per student.

TABLE 5

	1974	1975	1976	1977
$ Costs per Student	5.11	3.76	2.63	6.07

The costs of vandalism must also be viewed in the light of several additional factors, namely the amounts recovered by individual restitution as well as by insurance coverage. In the latter case the data must be understood in terms of the extent to which, in a particular year, the costs of arson constitutes a significant portion of the total costs for that year. Looked at in this light, we see the following:

TABLE 6

	1974	1975	1976	1977
Total $ Costs (all categories)	1981	1310	923	2114
Arson	1201	530	44	1090
Insurance Restitution	955	516	38	1085
Percentage of Total Costs Covered by Insurance	48	39	4	51

Thus it can readily be seen that to the extent that losses due to arson constitute approximately half the total costs for the years 1974 and 1977, the percentage of dollar recovery was reflected by insurance coverage. In the years 1975 and 1976 where this was not the case the amounts and percentages recoverable by insurance was considerably less.

The costs of the various security measures adopted by school jurisdictions (primarily urban) are as follows:

TABLE 7

	1974	1975	1976	1977
$ Costs of Security Measures	252	12	12	61

The data for 1974 and 1977 reflect rather heavy investments in the purchase and installation of expensive but sophisticated electronic surveillance systems by Calgary and Edmonton school jurisdictions, the largest in the survey.

These costs, when added as they must to those incurred by actual categorical losses, result in total cost figures which read thusly:

TABLE 8

	1974	1975	1976	1977
Total $ Costs - including costs of security measures adopted	2233	1322	935	2175
Individual Restitution	14	9	13	32
Percentage of Total $ Costs Recovered from Individual	.6	.7	1.4	1.5

An examination of the data for individual restitution (Table 8) would indicate that school officials are tightening up enforcement of school board policy already in place in most jurisdictions. The figures for 1977 reveal an increase of 100% in the percentage of total dollar costs recovered from individuals apprehended. It might also be construed as a spin-off from the heavy investments in security measures made earlier on and which are now just beginning to reflect itself in recoverable dollars.

The following tables indicate the costs of vandalism for the four years included in the study, broken down by category and month and expressed in thousands of dollars.

Combining the dollar costs, expressed in thousands, for each year 1974-77 in each category by month, reveals the following:

TABLE 9
TOTAL VANDALISM COSTS FOR 1974-1977 BY MONTH AND CATEGORY

	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	Jun.	Jul.	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total
Glass	77	78	94	138	142	159	138	157	142	162	150	97	1534
Bldg	120	170	158	148	149	138	85	97	121	158	155	147	1647
Theft	23	19	27	23	27	24	24	20	21	22	23	28	282
Arson	836	94	109	1	36	54	2	55	396	202	630	452	2865
Totals	1,056	361	388	310	354	375	249	329	680	544	958	724	6328

The table above indicates certain patterns with respect to the chronology of vandalism. It is noted, for example, that during the milder weather, April through November, the schools were most vulnerable to glass damage: $1,188,000 out of a total of $1,534,000 - accounting for over three-fourths of the sustained losses.

With respect to building damage, the notable feature is the relatively low losses of $85,000 and $97,000 respectively for the months of July and August which is to be expected in view of the absence of students in the schools during that period.

Theft losses due to break-ins seems to be a chronological constant.

Arson, on the other hand, would appear to be a factor consistent with the winter months: the lower periods occurring within the months, April through August, while the larger losses are reported for the months, September through March.

In the earlier status study, a significant feature was the comparison of costs between urban and rural schools as well as between public and separate. As was pointed out, in virtually every category of school

demography, the total costs went far beyond a simple mathematical progression dependent on school population figures.

An examination of the comparative figures for the years: 1974 - 1977 reveals the following:

TABLE 10

VANDALISM COSTS BY CATEGORY OF DAMAGE AND TYPE OF SCHOOL

YEAR					
1974			Public	Separate	Total
	Glass	Urban	276	49	
		Rural	30	8	
		Total	306	57	363
	Building	Urban	339	5	
		Rural	25	6	
		Total	364	11	375
	Theft	Urban	27	4	
		Rural	11	0	
		Total	38	4	42
	Arson	Urban	831	200	
		Rural	165	5	
		Total	996	205	1,201
					1,981

TABLE 11

VANDALISM COSTS BY CATEGORY OF DAMAGE AND TYPE OF SCHOOL

YEAR					
1975			Public	Separate	Total
	Glass	Urban	267	55	
		Rural	20	6	
		Total	287	61	348
	Building	Urban	304	16	
		Rural	18	0	
		Total	322	16	338
	Theft	Urban	80	9	
		Rural	4	0	
		Total	84	9	93
	Arson	Urban	523	5	
		Rural	2	0	
		Total	525	5	530
					1,310

TABLE 12

VANDALISM COSTS BY CATEGORY OF DAMAGE AND TYPE OF SCHOOL

YEAR					
1976			Public	Separate	Total
	Glass	Urban	269	60	
		Rural	27	10	
		Total	296	70	366
	Building	Urban	360	21	
		Rural	30	4	
		Total	390	25	415
	Theft	Urban	72	14	
		Rural	11	1	
		Total	83	15	98
	Arson	Urban	43	1	
		Rural	0	0	
		Total	43	1	44
					923

TABLE 13

VANDALISM COSTS BY CATEGORY OF DAMAGE AND TYPE OF SCHOOL

YEAR					
1977			Public	Separate	Total
	Glass	Urban	335	81	
		Rural	34	8	
		Total	369	89	458
	Building	Urban	466	21	
		Rural	16	16	
		Total	482	37	519
	Theft	Urban	28	4	
		Rural	15	1	
		Total	43	5	48
	Arson	Urban	1086	1	
		Rural	2	0	
		Total	1088	1	1,089
					2,114

When the costs in the tables above, 10 - 13, are divided by the student enrollment in the school jurisdictions reporting (78%), then we gain a picture of the costs per pupil for all categories which is a more significant statistic when comparing types of schools. Here we note, as in the earlier study, the persistent difference in costs per student between the public and separate schools as well as between the urban and rural schools.

TABLE 14

COMPARISONS OF TOTAL $ COSTS PER PUPIL FOR ALL CATEGORIES OF DAMAGE

TYPE OF SCHOOL	1974	1975	1976	1977	STUDENT ENROLLMENT MEAN - 1974-1977
Public	4.20	6.96	4.81	11.46	314
Separate	.97	2.04	2.84	4.15	70
Urban	5.40	7.96	5.77	12.67	257
Rural	.56	1.04	1.86	2.94	125

The separate school jurisdictions have per pupil costs which range from one-fourth to one-half the per pupil costs of the public school. The largest difference being $.97 per pupil as contrasted with $4.20 reported in 1974. The most favorable comparison occurs in 1976: $4.81 for public schools and $2.84 for separate schools.

The dollar costs per pupil difference between urban jurisdictions as opposed to rural schools was reported in 1974 in the order of a 10:1 ratio. It would appear from the table above that this difference has been considerably reduced since 1974; reaching a low of 3:1 in 1976 and then up

to 4:1 in 1977. This is due partly, although not entirely, to poor reporting systems especially in rural school jurisdictions whose data often represents only educated estimates.

Per pupil costs, where broken down by year, category of damage, and type of school provides yet another informative comparison:

TABLE 15

GLASS DAMAGE (DOLLAR COSTS PER PUPIL)

TYPE OF SCHOOL	1974	1975	1976	1977	MEAN COSTS
Public	.74	1.03	1.05	.96	.95
Separate	.75	.90	1.03	1.31	1.00
Urban	1.03	1.34	1.40	1.79	1.39
Rural	.22	.25	.31	.35	.28

Here we note that whereas per pupil costs for glass damage for public and separate schools was virtually the same in 1974, the mean per pupil cost of the report period indicates a .05 higher per pupil costs for the separate schools. A comparison of urban and rural schools in this report remains at constant 5:1 ratio in favor of the rural schools.

TABLE 16

BUILDING AND CONTENTS DAMAGE (DOLLAR COSTS PER PUPIL)

TYPE OF SCHOOL	1974	1975	1976	1977	MEAN COSTS
Public	.88	1.15	1.38	1.71	1.28
Separate	.14	.24	.37	.57	.33
Urban	1.08	1.34	1.40	1.79	1.40
Rural	.18	.17	.28	.29	.23

With the exception of a comparison between the public and separate schools the ratios of per pupil costs due to building and contents damage have remained constant. Separate school per pupil costs in this category have a mean for the report period indicating a reduced ration of 4:1 with the public schools as compared with the 6:1 ratio reported in 1974.

TABLE 17

THEFT (DOLLAR COSTS PER PUPIL)

TYPE OF SCHOOL	1974	1975	1976	1977	MEAN COSTS
Public	.09	.31	.29	.15	.21
Separate	.06	.12	.22	.09	.12
Urban	.10	.37	.37	.13	.24
Rural	.06	.05	.10	.15	.09

The contrast between schools in the matter of per pupil costs due to theft associated with break-ins continues to be rather substantial and even more emphatic when comparing public with separate schools. The difference in costs for 1977 being .06 per pupil as opposed to .03 in 1974, and a difference in mean costs at .09 per pupil.

TABLE 18

ARSON (DOLLAR COSTS PER PUPIL)

TYPE OF SCHOOL	1974	1975	1976	1977	MEAN COSTS
Public	2.41	1.88	.15	4.02	2.12
Separate	2.71	.07	.01	.03	.71
Urban	3.24	2.21	.19	4.65	2.57
Rural	.98	.02	.01	.01	.26

In no other category is the comparison between Public and Separate, Urban and Rural as pronounced as it is with respect to per pupil costs for arson. The mean costs are three times higher for Public Schools as opposed to Separate and ten times higher when comparing Urban Schools with Rural.

Table #19 below compares by year the total costs of vandalism which, when divided into the total number of incidents reported, reveals the dollar costs per incident.

TABLE 19

	1974	1975	1976	1977
Total Costs	1981	1310	923	2114
Total Incidents	12	10	7	9
$ Cost per Incident	165	131	132	235

A comparison of the dollar costs per incident expressed in thousands for all categories of vandalism by type of school is indicated by the following table:

TABLE 20

TYPE OF SCHOOL		1974	1975	1976	1977	MEAN COSTS
Public	# of Incidents	11	9	6	8	
	$ Costs per Incident	163	136	136	247	130
Separate	# of Incidents	1	.6	.9	.2	
	$ Costs per Incident	82	148	122	113	116
Urban	# of Incidents	11	9	6	8	
	$ Costs per Incident	155	140	141	253	172
Rural	# of Incidents	.5	.6	.6	.7	
	$ Costs per Incident	185	87	132	131	134

TABLE 21

RATIO OF NUMBER OF INCIDENTS OF VANDALISM TO ENROLLMENT (PER THOUSAND STUDENTS)

	1974	1975	1976	1977
Public	26.6	32.3	21.2	28.6
Separate	11.8	8.7	13.2	17.6
Urban	34.7	37.5	25.3	34.2
Rural	2.9	5.5	5.2	6.1

The table above sheds further insight in analysis of the data. When the number of reported incidents is divided by the enrollment in thousands of students, the results is a ratio that places the public schools in a somewhat more favorable comparison with separate school jurisdictions and urban schools with rural. The ratio for the public schools remained fairly constant for the report period, whereas there is an approximate 40% increase for the separate schools. The comparison is even more emphatic between urban and rural schools. Once again, a constant for the former and an increase of over 100% for the latter. A fair supposition could be put forth that in those areas where vandalism has been a problem it has largely been contained and that, correspondingly, in those areas where it has not been as great a problem, i.e. separate and rural school jurisdictions, are now experiencing an increase of sufficient proportion to warrant concern.

Another interesting feature of Table 21 above is the potential for prediction. A school district or division with X number of students, using the ratio of incidents per thousand students of the previous year could project the number of incidents which when multiplied by the costs per incident (Table 20) should result in a probable cost figure for school vandalism: $C = \frac{N}{1000} (R_I) (C_I)$ (Inflation factor: 15%)

The School Product News reported in 1977 that the vandalism dollar costs break down as follows:

Glass	-	25¢
Building	-	25¢
Theft	-	10¢
Arson	-	40¢

A review of the categorical costs for 1974 - 1977 demonstrates a division of costs that follows this pattern very closely:

	1974	1975	1976	1977	MEAN COSTS
Glass	18 ¢	27 ¢	38 ¢	22¢	26¢
Building	19¢	26¢	43¢	24¢	28¢
Theft	02¢	07¢	11¢	02¢	06¢
Arson	61¢	42¢	08¢	52¢	40¢

CONCLUSIONS

The primary purpose of this study was to establish a trend, if any existed, and then draw some conclusion about the efficacy of measures adopted in response to awareness of the extent of the problem with the publication of the status study in 1976.

Analysis of the data supplied for the years 1974 - 1977, while indicating higher overall totals when comparing the beginning year (1974) with the last year of the study (1977), nevertheless reveals a relatively stable condition. What substantial categorical increases there are can be explained in terms of the inflationary costs of replacement and repair which calculates at about ten to fifteen percent per year, depending upon the precise nature of that which is being replaced or repaired. As far as judgements about the heavy investments in security measures, it is still too soon to make any statements about their effectiveness except to point out, as was done at the outset of this report, that school jurisdictions seem to be holding their own with respect to vandalism losses.

Arson continues to form the major bulk of these losses despite the fact, on an annual basis, it is not a constant factor. Restitution from insurance, however, reimburses school jurisdictions so victimized for the major, if not entire, portion. This study did not include insurance premiums as a vandalism cost factor when, in fact, it would have been quite correct to do so. Despite full restitution in the event of arson, if the net result is a substantial rise in insurance premiums then the increase should be considered a legitimate cost of vandalism.

Finally, it must be reiterated in order to make the point emphatic, that the reliability of this kind of study is open to question for several

reasons. First, and foremost, is the issue of the validity of the data supplied. In too many instances - particularly in the small school jurisdictions - the information represented an educated guess as opposed to accurate figures substantiated by carefully controlled records. All of this only serves to re-emphasize the recommendation of the initial report, namely, that school jurisdictions in the province be required to faithfully record, on a uniform basis, the information with respect to vandalism losses. Until this happens survey reports of this kind must be understood in the full light of the deficiencies described.

SUMMARY

The primary purpose of this study was to establish a trend, if any existed, and then draw some conclusion about the efficacy of measures adopted in response to awareness of the extent of the problem with the publication of the status study in 1976.

Analysis of the data supplied for the years 1974 - 1977, while indicating higher overall totals when comparing the beginning year (1974) with the last year of the study (1977), nevertheless reveals a relatively stable condition. What substantial categorical increases there are can be explained in terms of the inflationary costs of replacement and repair which calculates at about 10% per year. As far as judgements about the heavy investments in security measures, it is still too soon to make any statements about their effectiveness except to point out, as was done at the outset of this report, that school jurisdictions seem to be holding their own with respect to vandalism losses.

Arson continues to form the major bulk of these losses despite the fact, on an annual basis, it is not a constant factor. Restitution from insurance, however, reimburses school jurisdictions so victimized for the major, if not entire, portion. This study did not include insurance premiums as a vandalism cost factor when, in fact, it would have been quite correct to do so. Despite full restitution in the event of arson, if the net result is a substantial rise in insurance premiums then the increase should be considered a legitimate cost of vandalism.

Finally, it must be reiterated in order to make the point emphatic, that the results of this kind of study should be interpreted with caution particularly because of the question of the validity of the data supplied.

In too many instances - especially in the small school jurisdictions - the information received represented at best an educated guess as opposed to accurate figures substantiated by carefully controlled records. This only serves to re-emphasize the recommendation of the initial report, namely, that school jurisdictions in the province be required to faithfully record, on a uniform basis, information with respect to vandalism losses. Until this happens, survey reports of this kind must be understood in the full light of the deficiencies described.

APPENDIX 1

ALBERTA SCHOOLS VANDALISM SURVEY

(For the period January 1, 1977 to December 31, 1977)
$ Costs Involved for Replacement and Repair

DATE		TOTAL NO. OF INCIDENTS	GLASS	DAMAGE TO BUILDING	THEFT OF CONTENTS	ARSON (Loss or Damage to Contents & Building	NO. OF CASES OF APPREHENSION	AMOUNT OF RESTITUTION From Individual	AMOUNT OF RESTITUTION From Insurance
January	01	3-5	6-10	11-16	17-21	22-28	29-30	31-35	36-41
February	02	3-5	6-10	11-16	17-21	22-28	29-30	31-35	36-41
March	03	3-5	6-10	11-16	17-21	22-28	29-30	31-35	36-41
April	04	3-5	6-10	11-16	17-21	22-28	29-30	31-35	36-41
May	05	3-5	6-10	11-16	17-21	22-28	29-30	31-35	36-41
June	06	3-5	6-10	11-16	17-21	22-28	29-30	31-35	36-41
July	07	3-5	6-10	11-16	17-21	22-28	29-30	31-35	36-41
August	08	3-5	6-10	11-16	17-21	22-28	29-30	31-35	36-41
September	09	3-5	6-10	11-16	17-21	22-28	29-30	31-35	36-41
October	10	3-5	6-10	11-16	17-21	22-28	29-30	31-35	36-41
November	11	3-5	6-10	11-16	17-21	22-28	29-30	31-35	36-41
December	12	3-5	6-10	11-16	17-21	22-28	29-30	31-35	36-41

42-44 School District _____ Mailing Address _____

45-47 Number of schools included in report _____

48-53 Total enrollment for the report period _____

54-57 Number of administrative staff (without teaching duties) _____ Signed: _____

58-61 Number of teaching personnel (including administration with teaching duties) _____ (Secretary-Treasurer)

62-64 Number of custodial help _____

65 Nature of continuing security measures (over and above custodial help) _____

_____

66-72 Cost of continuing security measures _____

73 Nature of any security measures adopted during report period _____

_____

74-80 Cost of security measure(s) adopted _____

APPENDIX 2

TABLE 22

TOTAL COST OF VANDALISM BY CATEGORY, YEAR, DOLLAR COST PER INCIDENT AND COSTS PER INCIDENT PER STUDENT

CATEGORY	YEAR 1974	1975	1976	1977
Glass Damage	363	347	366	458
Building Damage	374	339	415	519
Content Thefts	43	94	98	48
Arson (Contents and Building)	1201	530	44	1089
Total Costs	1981	1310	923	2114
Total Incidents	12	10	7	9
Dollar Cost per Incident	165	131	132	235
Total Enrollment	489	348	351	348
Dollar Cost per Student	5.11	3.77	2.63	6.07
Costs per Incident/Student *	.34	.38	.38	.68

*Expressed in mills

TABLE 23

AMOUNTS REIMBURSED BY INSURANCE AND INDIVIDUAL

CATEGORY	YEAR 1974	1975	1976	1977
Total Damage	1981	1310	923	2114
Individual Restitution - Amount	14	9	12	32
Percentage	.7	.7	1.3	1.5
Insurance Restitution - Amount	955	516	38	1085
Percentage	48	39	4	50

TABLE 24

COMPARATIVE ANNUAL VANDALISM COSTS
(INCLUDING COSTS OF SECURITY MEASURES)

	1974	1975	1976	1977
$ Costs of Security Measures	252	12	12	61
Vandalism Costs	1981	1310	923	2114
Total $ Costs	2233	1322	935	2175

TABLE 25

COST OF VANDALISM BY CATEGORY, MONTH AND YEAR

1974	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	Jun.	Jul.	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total
Glass	17	18	18	29	36	33	41	44	38	42	29	18	363
Bldg Damage	34	27	34	36	40	37	19	16	26	36	35	34	374
Content Thefts	2	3	6	5	2	3	3	3	2	4	2	8	43
Arson (Content & Bldg)	834	1	107	1	1	31	2	14	142	1	4	63	1201
Totals	887	49	165	71	79	104	65	77	208	83	70	123	1981
Enrollment	389												
Dollar Cost per Student	2.28	.15	.42	.18	.20	.27	.17	.20	.53	.21	.18	.32	

TABLE 26

COST OF VANDALISM BY CATEGORY, MONTH AND YEAR

1975	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	Jun.	Jul.	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total
Glass Damage	20	11	18	31	36	38	33	34	31	39	33	24	348
Bldg Damage	20	75	25	27	23	26	15	13	23	35	31	26	339
Content Thefts	7	8	8	9	8	7	6	7	7	8	9	9	93
Arson (Content & Bldg)	0	92	1	0	0	22	0	2	0	0	26	387	530
Totals	47	186	52	67	67	93	54	56	61	82	99	446	1310
Enrollment	348												
Dollar Cost per Student	.14	.53	.15	.19	.19	.27	.16	.16	.18	.24	.28	1.28	

TABLE 27

COST OF VANDALISM BY CATEGORY, MONTH AND YEAR

1976	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	Jun.	Jul.	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total
Glass Damage	18	22	24	32	33	36	23	37	32	35	48	26	366
Bldg Damage	30	28	46	33	37	37	14	33	36	39	40	42	415
Content Thefts	7	6	11	6	9	11	8	7	9	7	9	7	98
Arson (Content & Bldg)	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	39	3	0	0	0	44
Totals	55	57	82	71	79	84	45	116	80	81	97	75	923
Enrollment	351												
Dollar Cost per Student	.16	.16	.23	.20	.23	.24	.13	.33	.23	.23	.28	.21	

TABLE 28

COST OF VANDALISM BY CATEGORY, MONTH AND YEAR

1977	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	Jun.	Jul.	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total
Glass Damage	24	28	35	42	38	52	41	41	41	46	40	29	458
Bldg Damage	36	40	53	52	49	38	37	35	36	48	49	45	519
Content Thefts	7	2	2	3	8	3	7	3	3	3	3	4	48
Arson (Content & Bldg)	0	0	1	0	35	1	0	0	251	201	600	2	1090
Totals	67	70	91	97	130	94	85	79	331	298	692	80	2114
Enrollment	348												
Dollar Cost per Student	.19	.20	.26	.28	.37	.27	.24	.23	.95	.86	1.99	.23	

TABLE 29

TOTAL $ COSTS PUBLIC/URBAN BY CATEGORY AND YEAR

	1974	1975	1976	1977	Total
Glass Damage	276	267	269	335	1147
Bldg Damage	339	304	360	460	1463
Content Thefts	28	80	72	28	208
Arson (Content & Bldg)	831	523	42	1086	2482
Totals	1474	1174	743	1909	5300
Enrollment	179	180	180	177	
Dollar Cost per Student	8.21	6.52	4.13	10.79	
Total Incidents	12	10	7	9	
Costs per Incident/Student *	.69	.65	.59	1.20	

*Expressed in mills

TABLE 30

MONTHLY COST PUBLIC/URBAN BY CATEGORY

1974	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	Jun.	Jul.	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total
Glass Damage	12	10	14	23	29	28	31	31	30	32	23	13	276
Bldg Damage	35	26	33	33	35	34	15	19	24	25	30	30	339
Content Thefts	2	3	4	3	2	2	0	1	2	3	2	3	27
Arson (Content & Bldg)	827	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	831
Totals	876	39	51	59	66	65	47	51	58	60	55	46	1473

TABLE 31

MONTHLY COST PUBLIC/URBAN BY CATEGORY

1975	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	Jun.	Jul.	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total
Glass Damage	16	8	15	25	28	27	25	25	23	29	27	19	267
Bldg Damage	19	71	21	24	20	20	13	12	20	32	28	24	304
Content Thefts	7	7	6	6	7	7	6	6	6	7	7	8	80
Arson (Content & Bldg)	0	92	0	0	0	22	0	0	0	0	24	385	523
Totals	42	178	42	55	55	76	44	43	49	68	86	436	1174

TABLE 32

MONTHLY COST PUBLIC/URBAN BY CATEGORY

1976	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	Jun.	Jul.	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total
Glass Damage	15	16	18	23	25	27	14	24	24	25	40	18	269
Bldg Damage	28	26	30	31	34	34	11	31	33	33	36	33	360
Content Thefts	6	6	7	6	6	8	0	6	7	7	6	7	72
Arson (Content & Bldg)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	3	0	0	0	43
Totals	49	48	55	60	65	69	25	101	67	65	82	58	744

TABLE 33

MONTHLY COST PUBLIC/URBAN BY CATEGORY

1977	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	Jun.	Jul.	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total
Glass Damage	18	20	25	32	29	34	30	29	32	32	29	25	336
Bldg Damage	33	36	50	43	47	41	28	28	33	41	46	40	463
Content Thefts	3	2	2	2	3	2	1	2	2	3	2	4	27
Arson (Content & Bldg)	0	0	0	0	35	0	0	0	250	200	600	1	1087
Totals	54	58	77	77	114	77	59	59	317	276	677	70	1912

TABLE 34

TOTAL $ COSTS SEPARATE/URBAN BY CATEGORY AND YEAR

	1974	1975	1976	1977	Total
Glass Damage	49	55	60	82	246
Bldg Damage	5	16	22	23	65
Content Theft	4	8	15	5	31
Arson (Content & Bldg)	200	5	0	2	207
Totals	258	83	97	111	549
Enrollment	61	59	58	57	
Dollar Cost per Student	6.91	1.44	1.64	1.88	
Total Incidents	1	1	1	1	
Costs per Incident/Student	*6.91	1.44	1.64	1.88	

*Expressed in mills

TABLE 35

MONTHLY COST SEPARATE/URBAN BY CATEGORY

1974	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	Jun.	Jul.	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total
Glass Damage	4	4	3	4	4	4	5	6	5	5	3	2	49
Bldg Damage	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	5
Content Thefts	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4
Arson (Content & Bldg)	9	0	117	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	200
Totals	14	4	121	5	5	5	5	7	6	6	4	76	258

TABLE 36

MONTHLY COST SEPARATE/URBAN BY CATEGORY

1975	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	Jun.	Jul.	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total
Glass Damage	2	2	2	4	6	4	6	7	6	7	5	4	55
Bldg Damage	1	3	3	1	1	1	2	0	1	1	2	0	16
Content Thefts	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	8
Arson (Content & Bldg)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	5
Totals	3	5	6	7	8	6	8	9	7	9	11	6	83

TABLE 37

MONTHLY COST SEPARATE/URBAN BY CATEGORY

1976	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	Jun.	Jul.	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total
Glass Damage	2	4	2	6	5	6	6	7	6	6	6	4	60
Bldg Damage	1	0	9	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	22
Content Thefts	1	0	1	0	2	0	6	0	1	0	3	0	15
Arson (Content & Bldg)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	4	4	12	7	8	8	14	8	8	7	10	5	97

TABLE 38

MONTHLY COST SEPARATE/URBAN BY CATEGORY

1977	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	Jun.	Jul.	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total
Glass Damage	5	6	6	7	6	14	5	6	7	8	8	3	82
Bldg Damage	2	3	1	1	0	2	1	5	2	1	1	2	23
Content Thefts	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Arson (Content & Bldg)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Totals	7	9	7	9	9	17	6	11	9	9	9	5	111

TABLE 39

TOTAL PUBLIC/RURAL BY CATEGORY AND YEAR

	1974	1975	1976	1977	Total
Glass Damage	30	22	26	33	111
Bldg Damage	25	17	29	17	89
Content Thefts	11	5	11	15	42
Arson (Content & Bldg)	165	2	0	1	169
Totals	231	46	67	67	410
Enrollment	159	99	103	103	
Dollar Cost per Student	1.45	.46	.65	.65	
Total Incidents	1	.5	.6	.6	
Costs per Incident/Student	* 1.45	.92	1.1	1.1	

*Expressed in mills

TABLE 40

MONTHLY COST PUBLIC/RURAL BY CATEGORY

1974	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	Jun.	Jul.	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total
Glass Damage	1	1	1	2	1	1	5	6	5	3	2	2	30
Bldg Damage	1	1	1	2	2	2	3	1	3	3	1	5	25
Content Thefts	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	11
Arson (Content & Bldg)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	150	0	4	0	165
Totals	2	3	3	4	3	4	10	19	159	7	8	9	231

TABLE 41

MONTHLY COST PUBLIC/RURAL BY CATEGORY

1975	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	Jun.	Jul.	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total
Glass Damage	1	1	1	1	1	6	3	1	2	1	1	1	22
Bldg Damage	1	1	1	1	1	6	0	1	2	2	1	1	17
Content Thefts	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	5
Arson (Content & Bldg)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Totals	2	2	3	3	2	12	3	3	4	3	3	4	46

TABLE 42

MONTHLY COST PUBLIC/RURAL BY CATEGORY

1976	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	Jun.	Jul.	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total
Glass Damage	2	1	4	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	1	2	26
Bldg Damage	1	2	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	3	8	29
Content Thefts	0	0	4	0	0	2	1	2	1	0	1	0	11
Arson (Content & Bldg)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	3	3	14	3	3	6	4	5	4	6	5	10	67

TABLE 43

MONTHLY COST PUBLIC/RURAL BY CATEGORY

1977	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	Jun.	Jul.	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total
Glass Damage	1	1	4	1	3	3	5	5	2	6	2	1	33
Bldg Damage	1	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	5	1	1	17
Content Thefts	4	0	0	0	2	1	5	1	1	0	1	0	15
Arson (Content & Bldg)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
Totals	6	1	5	2	6	5	12	7	5	12	4	2	67

TABLE 44

TOTAL COST SEPARATE/RURAL BY CATEGORY AND YEAR

	1974	1975	1976	1977	Total
Glass Damage	8	6	9	7	30
Bldg Damage	6	0	3	16	25
Content Thefts	0	0	0	1	2
Arson (Content & Bldg)	5	0	0	0	5
Totals	19	6	12	25	63
Enrollment	13	10	11	11	
Dollar Cost per Student	1.47	.60	1.09	2.27	
Total Incidents	.06	.04	.05	.1	
Costs per Incident/Student	* 24.5	15	21.8	22.7	

*Expressed in mills

TABLE 45

MONTHLY COST SEPARATE/RURAL BY CATEGORY

1974	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	Jun.	Jul.	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total
Glass Damage	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	8
Bldg Damage	0	1	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	6
Content Thefts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arson (Content & Bldg)	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	5
Totals	1	2	1	1	3	5	1	1	1	0	1	2	19

TABLE 46

MONTHLY COST SEPARATE/RURAL BY CATEGORY

1975	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	Jun.	Jul.	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total
Glass Damage	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	6
Bldg Damage	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Content Thefts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arson (Content & Bldg)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	6

TABLE 47

MONTHLY COST SEPARATE/RURAL BY CATEGORY

1976	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	Jun.	Jul.	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total
Glass Damage	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	3	0	2	1	2	9
Bldg Damage	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3
Content Thefts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arson (Content & Bldg)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	3	0	3	1	2	12

TABLE 48

MONTHLY COST SEPARATE/RURAL BY CATEGORY

1977	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	Jun.	Jul.	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total
Glass Damage	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	7
Bldg Damage	0	0	0	6	1	0	5	1	0	1	0	2	16
Content Thefts	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Arson (Content & Bldg)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	0	1	1	8	2	0	6	2	0	2	1	2	25